

Supplemental Amendment and Interview Summary  
Ser. No. 09/662,737

REMARKS

Claims 1-46 are pending the present application with Claims 1, 34, 38 and 45 being independent claims. In the office action dated April 23, 2003, the Examiner rejected the claims based on the primary reference of U.S. Patent No. 6,336,105 to *Conklin et al.* ("*Conklin*").

The claimed system and method aggregates information for enterprises having separate exchanges and provides that information to shoppers. The claimed invention therefore relates to a method by which shoppers can view information on items that are available through multiple enterprises through a single-host, graphical user interface. The claimed invention offers many advantages over conventional searching techniques. Previously, a shopper would need to access, track and monitor items available at each of the plurality of exchanges. For instance, if a shopper was interested in a particular item, the shopper would go to an exchange or an auction site, perhaps on a daily basis, to see if that item was available. The shopper would also need to visit other exchanges or auction sites to see if the item was available on those sites and to monitor and to otherwise track the item. The claimed invention is much less labor intensive in that the shopper can go to a single site and see information that has been aggregated across the multiple exchanges. The foregoing amendment to the independent claims clarifies that the invention aggregates information on a particular item that is offered on at least two different exchanges or auction sites.

In contrast, *Conklin* provides no description of aggregating information from multiple enterprises, each having its own data base, and then providing that aggregated data to the shopper through a single-host graphical user interface. In rejecting the claims, the Examiner previously cited column 2, line 63 through column 3, line 4 of *Conklin*. The cited section of *Conklin* describes an on-line mall that enables buyers to browse through different stores. However, the different stores are presented via different websites. In particular, *Conklin* describes that "participating

Supplemental Amendment and Interview Summary  
Ser. No. 09/662,737

sellers in a mall 24 create their own websites which list items for sale and prices.” Column 3, lines 2-4. In addition, FIG. 9, step 615 describes that a buyer may proceed directly to each seller’s website.

*Conklin* describes that the different sellers use different individual websites. A shopper using the system described by *Conklin* is required to visit multiple websites to obtain information about items offered for sale by the various sellers. Thus, *Conklin* teaches away from the present invention because *Conklin* describes that different sellers create different websites in order to offer their products to buyers and that a buyer must access multiple websites to obtain information about items available for purchase. In contrast, the claimed invention describes that a buyer can reference a single website and obtain information that has been aggregated from different enterprises or auction sites without requiring that the shopper visit those individual enterprises or auction sites.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On November 4, 2003, a telephone interview was conducted between Examiner Ella Colbert and the undersigned. During the interview, independent Claims 34 and 45 were discussed, as well as *Conklin*. No agreement was reached during the interview.

Supplemental Amendment and Interview Summary  
Ser. No. 09/662,737

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are allowable and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any issues that can be resolved via a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Brenda Holmes at 404.685.6799.

Respectfully submitted,



Brenda O. Holmes  
Reg. No. 40,339

Kilpatrick Stockton LLP  
1100 Peachtree Street  
Suite 2800  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309  
(404) 815-6500  
KS File: L9090/269360